

I understand that Sinclair Broadcasting has decided to air an anti-Kerry documentary close to the time of the election, without giving equal air time to a pro-Kerry program. Is this legal, and if so isn't this an example of why we should not allow consolidation in the ownership of media outlets, such as TV and radio?

Since, Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest, there must be a requirement that they put on a pro-Kerry program. Large companies cannot be allowed to subvert the electoral process through the unadulterated promulgation of propaganda on the airwaves, whether they own those airwaves or not.

If Sinclair is allowed to get away with this type of blatant favoritism of one candidate over another, what is to stop any media owner, such as Rupert Murdoch, from running all of their own candidates for Congress and President, giving them massive amounts of free airtime under the guise of "newsworthy programming," and showing virtually none of their opponents advertising, claiming that their candidates had not run ads, just been included in news programs and therefore, it would not be fair to show ads promoting their opponents.

Please do your job and make sure that basic principles of fairness and the protection of the public's interest are enforced. Thank you.